JOURNAL OF MARXISM-NKRUMAISM

Issues of Pan-Africanism and Building the Socialist Mode of Production

The Annual Theoretical Organ of the Centre for Consciencist Studies and Analyses (CENCSA)

Vol. 1 No. 5 December 31, 2018

EDITORIAL

THE LEFT AS MANAGERS OF NEO-COLONIALISM
Crushing or Building to *Burst* the System?

Let it be understood that the bourgeoisie is not a transformation of the feudal nobility which once ruled it but a class with its own history of development from a subordinate class to a ruling class.

The citation below from *The Communist Manifesto* shows how the founders of Marxism conceived the historical trajectory of the emergence of the bourgeoisie.

Let no one deceive themselves that the rise of a subordinated class, whichever class, to power is a simple task of forming a political party to capture political power – the existing State power and its structure!

Every emerging class builds its own State through its own independent economic build-up to ultimately place it over society in replacement of the existing State.

Below is the citation:

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, cornerstone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for *managing* the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, *Collected Works, Vol. 6*, Progress Publishers, 1845-48, p. 486.

Must The Left seek to be the *managers* of *this* State?

Typical Scene Of Sharing Maize At Odometa

CONTENTS

Ideological Determinations

Kwame Nkrumah's *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* and the Current Stage of the African Revolution - From the Perspective of the Three-Zone-Theory

Applications
On The Revolutionary Path - Abstract
by Lang T. K. A. Nubuor

Research and Experiments
The Odometa Report
By Lang T. K. A. Nubuor

Matters Arising
From the Facebook Platform
Forum For African Affairs
December 7-9 2018

Revolutionary patience is the spirit of scientific inquiry and action in pursuit of scientific socialism and communism.

KWAME NKRUMAH'S *HANDBOOK OF REVOLUTIONARY WARFARE* AND THE CURRENT STAGE OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

From the Perspective of the Three-Zone-Theory

Abstract

This critical appreciative review of Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's book *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* has a view to assessing what is christened as its three-zone-theory. That theory notes three different territories in Africa in which the African Revolution seeks to liberate the continent and its people across the world. These are the *liberated* territories, the *contested* territories and the *enemy-controlled* territories which are all conceived as *zones* of the African Liberation Struggles. In this presentation, the view is held that the *Handbook* still remains relevant to the liberation struggles in Africa. It, nonetheless, observes that strategically the three-zone-theory, historically, has been undermined by the sway of neo-colonialism across the African continent. This sway virtually wipes off the *liberated* and *contested* zones in the era of colonialism and leaves us with the enemy-controlled zone which now engulfs the other two zones. Just like in the enemy-controlled zones of the colonial period the armed revolutionary struggle, in the view of this presentation, remains in this neo-colonial period the strategic option in the prosecution of the African Liberation Struggle. In itself, the presentation observes that this suggests that the three-zone-theory has received a *temporary* setback which could be reset once the armed revolutionary struggle enters its new phase and *begins to make gains* on the currently enemy-wholly-controlled space. Hence, in its present state the three-zone-theory, in the understanding of the presentation, is not *dead* but, if it might be put in metaphorical terms, it is only *partly* comatose to be fully resurrected in the *fires* of the people's armed revolutionary struggle. Given the current state of the liberation struggle the presentation observes in the *Handbook* the *theoretical framework* within which armed revolutionary struggle is perceived and conceived as well as projected to be prosecuted in the next phase of armed revolutionary struggle across Africa. Textual citations are employed to trace the configuration of that framework and the practical projections referenced above.

CENCSA
September 11 2018

Both the basic nature of neo-colonialism and the accumulated experience of liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America indicate clearly that *the only way* for the broad masses to eradicate neo-colonialism is through a revolutionary movement springing from a direct confrontation with the imperialists, and drawing its strength from the exploited and disinherited masses.

The struggle against puppet governments, and against all forms of exploitation, is the basic condition for the survival and development of a genuine liberation movement in Africa. We must accept the challenge and fight to destroy this *threat* to our future as a free and united continent.

The armed forces of foreign powers in various strategically-important parts of our continent present a serious *threat* but *not an insurmountable obstacle* in the African revolutionary struggle …

In comparison, the Independent States of Africa are at present militarily weak. Unlike the imperialists and neo-colonialists they have no mutual defence system and no unified command to plan and direct joint action.

But this will be remedied with the formation of the All-African People's Revolutionary Army and the setting up of organisations to extend and plan effective revolutionary warfare *on a continental scale*.

We possess the vital ingredient necessary to win, — the full and enthusiastic support of the broad masses of the African people who are determined once and for all to end all forms of foreign exploitation, to manage their own affairs, and to determine their own future. Against such overwhelming strength organised on a Pan-African basis, *no amount of enemy forces can hope to succeed*.

Kwame Nkrumah*, Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* (1968), pp. 16, 22-23

A Significant Clarification

In our consideration of the *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* there is the need to distinguish between a ‘phase’ and a ‘stage’ of a process of any social

phenomenon. These concepts respectively correspond to the 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' *aspects* in the development of such a phenomenon.

From this perspective, *armed* revolutionary struggle, as a phenomenon in Africa, is a *stage* within the process of the African Liberation Struggle in Africa and beyond; the previous *stage* being *non-violent* confrontations against the *colonial* system. Hence, the two are stages *within* the Liberation Struggle. But each stage bears its own *phases*; that is, while the African Liberation Struggle by itself is a stage *within* the African Revolution.

This understanding of *stages* within the *African Liberation Struggle* is akin to the book's other categorization of colonialism and neo-colonialism as 'stages' of *Imperialism* at page 30. In its thought, we find the *non-violent stage* and the *first* phase of armed revolutionary struggle in a symmetrical correspondence to the *colonial stage* while the '*new* phase of the armed revolutionary struggle' does likewise in correspondence to the *neo-colonial stage*. Follow schemas:

Stages

African Revolution ➡Liberation Struggle ➡Non-Violent Struggle ➡Armed Revolutionary Struggle (ARS) ➡Socialist United Africa

Phases

Non-Violent Struggle (Stage) ➡ First Phase (Proto-Nationalism – A Call for Inclusiveness) ➡ Second Phase (Modern Nationalism I – A Call for Negotiated National Independence) ➡ Third Phase (Modern Nationalism – A Call for Positive Action of Non-Cooperation) [Within Colonialism]

Armed Rev. Struggle (Stage) ➡ First Phase (Colonialism) ➡ Second Phase (Neo-Colonialism)

Socialist United Africa (Stage) ➡ First Phase (Incipient Within Neo-Colonialism) ➡Second Phase (Full Fledge After Neo-Colonialism)

This projects the armed revolutionary struggle as one that develops *from* the womb of *colonialism* in its *first phase* and proceeds to develop its *second phase* within and in confrontation with *neo-colonialism*. Hence, it is the *second* (new) *phase* of the armed revolutionary struggle that corresponds to the neo-colonial *stage* which engulfs the *entire* continent simultaneously. This means that with the development of the *neo-colonial* system in Africa armed revolutionary struggle enters its *second* phase.

The *Handbook's* careful use of 'phase' and 'stage' helps us to avoid the confusion that the 'Publisher's Note' in the book introduces by its interchangeable use of those terms when it talks about 'the new *phase* of the African Revolution' and 'the new *stage* of the African Revolution' at the same time as if the

two mean the same thing. The book talks about '[the] present *stage* of the *liberation struggle*' (p.29) and '[the] new *phase* of the *armed revolutionary struggle* in Africa'. (In the Preface)

The African Liberation Struggle is a *stage* of the African Revolution and the armed revolutionary struggle as a *stage* within the African Liberation Struggle has developed its first (that is, old) and second (that is, new) *phases*. This conception of the armed revolutionary struggle as a *stage* but not a *phase* of the Liberation Struggle appears compromised by that section of the 'Author's Note' which refers to 'the armed *phase* of the African revolutionary struggle'.

In fact, the sub-title of the book refers to 'A Guide to the Armed Phase of the African Revolution'. This seeming difficulty could be resolved in our mind if we equate 'the Armed Phase of the African Revolution' or 'the armed phase of the African revolutionary struggle' to 'the *new phase* of the armed revolutionary struggle in Africa' as cited from the Preface above. This should suggest to us that the book is *principally* concerned with *the second phase of the armed revolutionary struggle* and, therefore, *the stage of neo-colonialism*.

As we would find out below, the *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare*, like her elder sister, *Neo-Colonialism – The Last Stage of Imperialism*, is primarily focused on the question of Neo-Colonialism and its institutions which it programmes to *destroy* but *not inherit* in a process of continent-wide politico-military confrontation that the author, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, considers to be '*the key* to African freedom and … *the only way* in which the total liberation and unity of the African continent can be achieved.' (Pp.20-21)

The Theoretical Framework

The *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare* applies a dialectical and historical materialist *theoretical framework* in the construct of its analysis of the African condition and projection of Pan-Africanism as its Programme for the liberation of the African continent and people from capitalist imperialism through the destruction of the neo-colonial system to give in to the flowering of a Socialist United Africa that grows as an *embryo* within that system. This section briefly tries to map out the configurations/outlines of the said theoretical framework.

- *This paper had barely started in development when the author fell ill. It was to have been presented at a seminar organised by the All-Africa People's Revolutionary Party (A-APRP) on September17-19 2018 in Ghana prior to and in commemoration of the Kwame Nkrumah Founder's Day events. The author has since then not recovered sufficiently to continue to develop it. We hope he would do so in the next edition of this Journal. The publication here symbolises his apologies to the All-Africa People's Revolutionary Party (A-APRP). Forward Ever!*

BACK TO CONTENTS

Applications

ON THE REVOLUTIONARY PATH

Consciously Building 'A Tradition of the Revolutionary Spirit' In the African Mind and Culture

Abstract

Tracing the Revolutionary Path in African History, this paper develops an idea of the need to cultivate 'A Tradition of the Revolutionary Spirit' in the African Conscience and in defining the African Personality. History of the revolutionary struggles preceding the All-African People's Conference (1958) and the latter's aftermath, according to this paper, requires a statement not only of its concrete details but also of its spirit in terms of the principles that animated it. Such are the principles, it contends, that should predominate and define the African Mind in reflection of Africa's state of affairs and thought directed in response to it. These principles, it holds, should be under constant critical assessment for their development and application in response to the unfolding dynamics of the African condition. Such conditions, it says, are the off-shoot from the process of changing dynamics leading to the virtual dissolution of African communal systems, their replacement by semi-feudal and feudal systems, the imposition of the capitalist primitive accumulation system on these emergent systems that had developed from *bona fide* indigenous endeavours and struggles, and the further subordination of those indigenous systems to the principles of imperialist capitalist colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation. Throughout the class systems, this paper holds further, there has always been people's resistance to them. The Conference in Accra and its follow-ups were a continuation of that Resistance which developed into a stage of armed revolutionary struggles for Africa's liberation. The inception of neo-colonialism since then has led to a more continent-wide system of exploitation and control of Africa with a corresponding foreign military bases-system across the continent to safeguard the exploitative interests of imperialist neo-colonialism. Such development, this paper observes, elicits an expansive and co-ordinated phase of revolutionary warfare across Africa in correspondence to the continental reach of neo-colonialism. It requires a study of the Principles of African Resistance as gleaned from Africa's history and consciously developed as Africa's Tradition of its Revolutionary Spirit just as other countries have. This paper, forthwith, attempts that.

Lang T. K. A. Nubuor
Director
Centre for Consciencist Studies and Analyses (CENCSA)

Tema, Ghana
September 7 2018

* For The Records

Upon the invitation for *Abstracts* from the Organising Committee of the Institute of African Studies of the University of Ghana in commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the All-Africa People's Conference the above *Abstract* was submitted to it by e-mail. In its acknowledgement of receipt the Committee promised to respond in two weeks' time. For whatever reason, it could not do that even after the presentation of papers on December 5 and thereafter. The author has promised to develop this *Abstract* for the next edition of the *Journal of Marxism-Nkrumaism* if his health so permits.

BACK TO CONTENTS

THE ODOMETA REPORT

By
Lang T.K.A. Nubuor

The aim of this research, undertaken at Odometa in the Eastern Region of Ghana from October 2 2018 to December 5 2018, was to empirically test on the ground the strategy of Alternative Development as applied to the existing capitalist neo-colonial system and defined thus:

> Alternative Development is the independent mass-based strategy to consciously **search** for the embryo of an emerging socialist system (or its production relations) within an existing capitalist neo-colonial system so as to **develop** it to ultimately burst and replace the latter system.

As a protagonist of the African Socialist Revolution and researcher of the dynamics of World Revolutions in Europe and Asia in the main as well as other Revolutions in other parts of the world this author had observed Revolutions as *processes* of evolution within existing socio-economico-political formations that reach a point of explosion from which a new such formation emerges.

The author had observed that the reverses that *intended* Revolutions suffered particularly in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) were essentially occasioned by attempts to *impose* a socialist system unto societies that had not yet developed in them an *embryo* of that system unlike the previous revolutions that did so and made that embryo the foundation to be *built* on.

It was further observed that attempts at socialist construction in Africa did not single out an appropriate set of *existing* production relations as an *embryo* that might be the foundation upon which the edifice of the socialist system would be built. Such attempts followed those of the then leading socialist efforts and thus sought to *impose* the socialist system on the multiple of existing systems.

The strategy of Alternative Development learns from these futile attempts at *imposing* the socialist system and draws the conclusion that attempts at building socialism must be based on an *existing* embryo of socialist relations for starters. This author, therefore, set out to the countryside to search for such an embryo, if any, and found it in the form of its seed, *a rugged principle of equality*, with a *potential* to be developed as an embryo of socialist relations.

This is the Report of the research.

The Land Question at Odometa

Odometa is a community with single families living on single strips of land that are narrow and long. These strips of land belong to members of the Krobo Odumase royalty who are mostly not living on the land currently. Those living there are landless peasant farmers who are either caretakers or tenants. The land was previously purchased from the neighbouring Akyem people in the 19th Century.

Generational inheritance has led to a process of sharing the land among wives and their children within the polygamous royalty. That sharing process has progressively diminished and continues to diminish the sizes of shared-lands over the decades. Holdings are, hence, mostly used for small-scale farming in maize, plantain, banana, cassava, cocoyam, etc., while few are used in the cultivation of oil palm plantations. A few more are used for a limited mix of all.

Being mostly educated, members of the royalty are themselves engaged in occupations outside agriculture while their respective holdings are left either in the hands of caretakers who occasionally give them some of the harvest or that such holdings are shared among the landless peasantry with whom harvested crops are shared according to agreed formulae based on crop type. The landless peasantry could also hire the piece of land at a fee.

At Odometa, nobody sells their land. Any attempt to encroach on any part of it is promptly faced with a mass-resistance. The rights of inheritance in land are strictly observed though an instance of a dubious character is reported to have manipulated his way into acquiring land that he does not, by the rules of inheritance, deserve. But such rare manoeuvres are within royalty as they do not involve the landless peasantry who could, at best, offer secret support.

Terms of Land Use

As indicated above, land is not sold at Odometa. It could, however, be *hired* out over a period of three years or multiples of three years. In the terms of a mortgage system known as '*awaba'*, a piece of land or a whole parcel of it could be released for the use of a *lender* over a negotiated period of twenty or more years at the expiration of which the land reverts to its owner. A clause might hold that the land be retrieved upon earlier payment than agreed on.

The most widespread method of land use at Odometa is the parcelling of pieces of it to landless young peasant farmers for cultivation. Whatever comes out as harvest from such cultivation is shared between the landowner and the peasant farmer. The terms are flexible. In the first instance, the peasant, as an

individual, undertakes to make all expenses on the farm and apply his own labour-power. In the second instance, the landowner shares in the expenses.

These terms of land use are reflected in the manner the matured or harvested produce is shared between the landlord and the peasant. In the case of maize production, where the peasant farmer makes all the expenses, he/she is entitled to two-thirds ($^2/_3$) of the produce while the landlord is entitled to one-third ($^1/_3$). Where, on the other hand, the landlord makes all the expenses with the exception of labour cost, which the peasant bears, share is half ($^1/_2$) each.

In the case of cassava cultivation, the peasant farmer bears all costs while the produce, which takes a year or two to mature, is shared half ($^1/_2$) each. Let us note that maize takes three months only to mature in contrast with cassava which takes a year or two. Perhaps, the need for frequent cash within the year determines the peasant preferring maize cultivation to that of cassava. It could also be the burden of expenses that determines the preference. It's not clear.

Plantain, banana and cocoyam as well as sweet potatoes, not cultivated on a wide scale, are generally meant for the peasant farmer's consumption although some could be given or sent to the landowner during their visit or upon request, respectively. No fast rules are attached to or stipulated for such produce. The same attitude applies to the fresh maize from which the peasant takes and cooks for immediate consumption and gives same to the landowner.

Oil palm cultivation assumes the form of the landowner's preserve. They hire the labour-power of the peasants or their children to cultivate them and pay them off upon completion of any particular task in the day or over a period of days. The Asare Odometa Plantations, apart from its oil palm plantations, assists landowners to cultivate oil palm as out-growers whose produce is then exchanged in payment for all expenses. After the payment it then buys them.

Animal rearing is not yet an ambitious undertaking at Odometa. All the same, the practice is that if a landowner buys, say, a goat or sheep for a peasant to rear the offspring of the animals are shared equally between them; with no offspring, all lose. In case only one offspring is delivered that goes to the peasant, in the first instance. In the second instance of another single delivery that goes to the landowner. Otherwise, there is equal sharing of the litters.

The Asare Odometa Plantations, in this light, is different. It has an impressive piggery where, on our visit, there were seventy-six (76) pigs in their stys. It *hires* workers and pays them *monthly* salaries. It gains or loses alone. This appears to be the only instance at Odometa where the peasantry has been proletarianised, though, on a very small scale. The owner of Asare Odometa Plantations, Mr. Neneyo Mate-Kole, inherited his father who was a royal.

Production Relations

The terms of land use spelt out above portray the production relations at Odometa. By these, a peasant, who has been able to make some savings to hire a piece of land from a landowner is free from the latter over at least the three-year period or more of the hire; and this is strictly so. During our stay an instance occurred where a landowner, who had hired out a piece of land to a female peasant in March 2016 for three years, had to share the latter's cassava equally with her for supposedly overstaying the period in November 2018.

Although the period had been miscalculated by the landowner the peasant did not resist the error which she and her husband decided to ignore for fear of the landowner resorting to some extra-terrestrial applications against her. Our observation in this respect was the tacit acknowledgement by the peasants of the principle that in case one overstays the period of the hire even for a few months the landowner has a right to share the produce with her.

Land hiring, and this currently goes at the rate of 84'x12' (*kpang*) for GHC200 over a three-year period, is not the popular preference around. The landless peasants, lacking in means, resort to the sharing system whereby they have access to *any* measurement of land in exchange for a share of the produce with the landowner. This means that a landowner could have many peasants as he/she requires on the land. Such peasants are *individually* contracted.

The *individual* nature of the contracts suggests that each peasant is treated in isolation from all others on the same land and that the peasants do not have *working relations* with each other. Each works their portion of the land. Only the landowner has such working relations with *all* of them. This breeds grounds for inter-peasant jealousies and backbiting for favours from the landowner. Unsubstantiated reports could lead to friction with the landowner.

A peasant, who has difficulties in one way or the other and, therefore, cannot themselves work the land, could hire labour and pay for it. This brings the peasant into production relations with the "by-day labourers" who might or might not be known to the landowner and, therefore, do not relate to the latter in any *formal* terms. The landowner, as such, cannot be indebted to the labourers in case the peasant fails to pay them for work done. Interesting.

All these change, however, when the landowner assumes the responsibility of financing activities on the farms, in the case of maize cultivation, for example, so as to have an equal share with the sharecroppers. In this case, so to speak, they develop production relations not only with the peasants but also with the "by-day labourers". Clearly, then, this complicates the production relations subsisting on the land or on the particular farm where that contract holds.

In the midst of these practices in production relations, an old communal practice persists but it is dying out and scarcely resorted to. By this practice, a group of peasants would assist each other on their farms in rotation (*katsu*) until all the farms are kept in functioning order. Although this practice was mentioned in our discussions with the peasantry, both landowners and sharecroppers, we did not see it being practised anywhere at Odometa.

Finally, proletarianization in creating emergent capitalist production relations with a working class is currently on a very small scale, as stated above, but requires observation in its development over the coming years at Odometa.

Industry

Industry at Odometa is of two types – the predominant cottage industry and the singular heavy industry that Asare Odometa Plantations undertakes. While the Asare Odometa Plantations has heavy industrial manufacturing machines for the manufacture of crude palm oil the peasant farmers employ very simple means for their crude palm oil, palm kernel oil, corn and cassava dough, gari and brooms. These latter are sold mainly at the Asesewa Market on Fridays.

The Asare Odometa Plantations' palm oil manufacturing industry is fed with the fresh palm nuts from its own plantations as well as from those of outgrowers near and far. This contrasts with the cottage industries of the peasants which are fed with the peasants' own shares in maize and cassava cultivation as well as oil palm nuts provided by the landowners who are into oil palm cultivation. This derived palm oil is shared $^{2}/_{3}$ and $^{1}/_{3}$ in landowners' favour.

Youth

The main thrust of Odometa youth is made up of young persons who, for various reasons, terminate their education before or after completion at the elementary school level. Others proceed to the Junior Secondary School level but also terminate their education before or after completion. While these feed the "by-day labourers" section of the rural community some of them have ambitions of learning a trade of one type or the other.

Adult impressions about these youth are generally negative. They are seen to be in a hurry to acquire wealth but lazy. They are said to be disobedient to their parents and could refuse to go to farm if they so decided. We could not have an opportunity to interact with them much due mainly to our poor health. From the little opportunity we had to do so we found some of them expressly ready to engage in income-yielding ventures like animal husbandry.

Lifestyle

Odometa life is fraught with several difficulties. Electricity supply from the nearby town of Asesewa ends at the Asare Odometa Plantations. Night life essentially ends at 7 p.m. when people retire to bed. Radio sets provide access to the rest of the country. Television sets are understandably absent. Apart from Fridays, transportation is not readily available. As such, the people usually walk to town even sometimes on Fridays. A few have bicycles.

While foodstuffs are readily available in their freshness fish is not. Wednesday is the market day at nearby Akate along the Volta River. There, the people go to engage in *barter trading* whereby they exchange foodstuffs for fresh, dried, smoked or salted fish like tilapia. Fish gained could last for a week or more. The Ngmayem Festival sees them in splendour at downtown Odumase.

Observations and Recommendations

From the above, it is clear that life at Odometa exhibits *modes* of production as a multiple that subsist with each other: we observe a semi-feudal mode of production *within* which old communal and emergent capitalist production relations interact with the dominant semi-feudal production relations; within that nexus we observe a *strange* resort to a *principle of equality* in *relations of inequality* whereby, except in maize cultivation, the landowner bears no cost.

This apparent aberration in the application of the principle of equality, in fact, enhances the fortunes of the landowner more than when the produce is shared on the application of the unequal principle of two-thirds ($^2/_3$) to the peasant and one-third ($^1/_3$) to the landowner in maize cultivation. In this latter application, it is understood that one-third ($^1/_3$) from the peasant's two-thirds ($^2/_3$) takes care of the expenses made; so that each effectively gets one-third ($^1/_3$).

In this respect, where the landowner takes one-half ($^1/_2$) of the produce with no expenses borne by them that amounts to an enhancement of receipt. This renders the principle of equality popular with the landowner and with the peasant *as well*, surprisingly. But the peasants are not enthused in reality by this arrangement. Hence, those who can afford it rather *hire* the land from the landowner at a fee projected to be lower than what might be the latter's share.

It is observed then that the preferred practice of the landless peasantry is the *hire* of land which is never put up for *sale*. Unfortunately, most of the peasants either do not have the means to hire land or most landowners insist on not hiring. Hence, the principle of equality, *as upheld now*, turns out to be the predominant acceptable choice for application among the peasantry. An opportunity to hire land, all the same, offers a more acceptable option.

And such opportunities occasionally come up when a landowner either needs instant cash to fulfil an obligation or they die and the family does not have the means to finance the funeral expenses. In such a case, resort is to the *awaba* practice of land mortgaging. Only a revolutionary organisation or enterprise with the means can utilise that opportunity to acquire the land for the peasantry on the basis of an *enhanced* meaning of the principle of equality.

We observe then that the principle of equality in that instance is enhanced when the burden of expenses shifts from the shoulders of the peasantry in the first year or so to the organisation. At the end of the said period the produce is shared equally between the organisation and the peasants after a deduction of projected expenses for the *next* season. This leaves the landless peasants with their individual holdings, to start with, but as *members* of the organisation.

And as such members they are consciously organised increasingly into a *co-operative* which discusses issues of productivity for mutual benefits in the direction of enhancing interaction to break the barriers that individual holdings erect against collectivisation of farming which is an objective of the organisation towards the development of the principle of equality as *the* seed for an embryo of socialist development on the basis of *volition* but never *force*.

Let us not forget to mention at this stage that accumulated proceeds in the coffers of the organisation would not only be utilised to develop the cottage agro-processing industries of the peasantry to add value to the primary produce but also to hire or acquire more land for the spread of the emerging socialist mode of production in areas near and far across the African continent and beyond to other capitalist neo-colonised so-called developing countries.

We are now obliged to observe that in our interaction with a cross-section of the peasantry this line of thought was welcoming even with enthusiasm among the landless peasants. The bridge between proposition and realisation is the readiness of a revolutionary organisation to mobilise the resources for the needed intervention to *nurture* the existing principle of equality among the peasantry as the seed/embryo for developing a socialist mode of production.

That is the strategy of Alternative Development as upheld by the concrete situation among the peasantry at Odometa. But the peasantry is only a part, though a significant one, among the working people in Africa. How the other working people in African society organically relate to such a peasantry that is transformed into *worker-owners* is the next part in the development of this research. It is hoped that that would be as soon as the situation would allow.

Conclusions

The research looked out for an *already* emerging embryo of a socialist mode of production or its production relations at Odometa. It found among the

peasantry *a rugged principle of equality* with a *potential* of being consciously developed as a socialist principle reflective of incipient socialist production relations. It found a *type* of application of the *principle of equality* that inures more to the landowner class than to the landless peasantry who do not only offer labour but also incur all expenses in cultivation and animal husbandry.

The research observed that the force of the circumstances of their deprivation in land compels the peasantry to embrace the current rendition of *the principle of equality*. They, all the same, have an option of *hiring* the land. That accrues to them a more sizeable portion of the produce than in sharecropping. The obstacle in this respect is their inability to afford the hire or the understandable reluctance of the landowners to hire out. Only a few affords hiring.

In our interaction with the peasantry a cross-section of them would prefer the burden of expenses lifted off them. They are amenable to an Organisation or Enterprise, with the capacity, to bear the said expenses on the basis of the operative *principle of equality* in the share of the produce. This entails the bearing of all the expenses in the *first year or* so by the Organisation. In the later years all planned expenses would be deducted before sharing.

To redress the individualism that individual holdings foster among the class of peasants it is recommended that the Organisation registers them into its fold so as to encourage interaction among them around issues of mutual interest, like productivity. The objective is to steadily develop them into a worker-owners co-operative wherein the Organisation *nurtures* them as its partner collective owners of the *farm* while the *land* remains in its control.

In summary, therefore, the research partly confirms the strategy of Alternative Development in terms of its discovery of a seed, *a rugged principle of equality*, which, in the light of tendencies among the peasantry, has the potential of being developed as an embryo of a fully-fledged socialist principle of development. The process of such a development is based on the development of the *underlining production relations* which the *rugged principle of equality* reflects.

Message to the Youth

It is normal for the youth of any society to expect changes in it to be as rapid as possible. Unfortunately, such expectations are presumed possible only upon the initiatives of the neo-colonial State which is essentially made to *retain* the *status quo* and *manage* the socio-economic system in *continued existence* but not to *replace* it. Such a presumption predisposes the youth to prospects of 'capturing political power' which, when achieved, just reproduces personnel.

The expected change remains elusive as the youth in power now find that *they have to go by the rules and regulations* of the same festering State if they are to remain in power. With expectations of running the State in the direction of

their vision they find themselves being run by that State in *its* predetermined line of motion and direction. Whipped into line such youth turn out to be the most committed champions of the neo-colonial State's survival in corruption.

It is not the duty of the revolutionary youth to *capture neo-colonial State power* but to *build* an alternative power system from the grassroots of society with the masses of our people in charge of the process of change to *replace* that historically *imposed* and consequently congenital problems-ridden State. A neo-colonial State is not *captured* but *burst asunder* with the development and growth of a new State which simultaneously *replaces* it in a *process* of change.

The tendency is to ask for an example of this. History is replete with instances of such explosions - from slavery to feudalism; from feudalism to capitalism; and now the seed sown by semi-feudal and capitalist development struggling quietly to burst as an embryo of socialism. Those who refuse to observe the example in this should just continue to live in their own world while being taken unawares by the *gbeyecious* explosion of live socialism into existence.

Tracing the rise of the bourgeoisie as a *class* (not a few individuals of that *class*) to political power, *The Communist Manifesto* observes that the rise was a *necessary consequence* and, therefore, not the *antecedent* of the process. Read the ensuing from Karl Marx & Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works, Vol. 6*, p. 488

> The bourgeoisie keeps *more and more* doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The *necessary consequence* of *this* was political centralisation.

Achievement of political centralisation, i.e. State power, is *not* the *antecedent* in the process of *revolutionary* social change but its *tail end*, its *necessary consequence*. This must never be confused with the *nationalist* slogan of *Seek ye first the Political Kingdom* … where the struggle was for the *existing* State.

Let the youth continually bear in mind the motto: Service, Sacrifice, Suffering. That's the professional revolutionary's spirit inspired by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah. A genuine revolutionary process competently feeds, clothes and shelters its partakers without their need to resort to corruption. The revolutionary youth is invited to commit to this life-long process of change for the eternal glory of the new generations of Africans who would have no inkling of our sufferings.

Let's Grow Slowly In Silence
And Allow
The Silent Voice of PROCESS To Shape Us In Success.

The Secret of Life Is To Have No Fear.

Forward Ever!
Onward to the African Socialist Revolution!

Tema
December 19 2018

BACK TO CONTENTS

FROM THE FACEBOOK PLATFORM
FORUM FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS
December 7-9 2018

M Bharat: Even if we accept that China is a Socialist country, where the means of production is controlled by the proletarian class, where the party of the proletarian class, CPC controls the country's production & distribution, where no one hires another man to usurp surplus value; how do we conceive Socialist China "investing" into other country for profit, where the rulers are capitalist class, whom is Socialist China helping, the proletarian class or the capitalist class in the target country?

Multi-polar world, where the world market is super saturated, neo-liberalism or even fascism is engulfing the world nations, terrorism & war are full-fledged business for high rate of profit, where the world leaders are outright criminals and anti-women, anti-workers, anti-science, and in fact are buffoons, seems to have confused the intellectuals, revolutionary ideologues! And confusion is on the basics of Marxism Leninism, where the charlatan Xi, too, seems to have command over a new brand of "Communists", who say that socialist building in China is with Chinese conditions, which is similar to capitalism, or at the best resembles "Mixed Economy"!

Though sad, but the billions of world citizens, suffering due (monopoly) capitalism, honest intellectuals are rising, re-thinking, going back to the classics of Marxism Leninism (Dialectical & Historical Materialism, Bolshevism, Dictatorship of the proletarian class, etc) for a new wave of proletarian revolution, and will succeed to demolish the hegemony of finance capital and establish Scientific Socialism and free the Earthians from all forms of slavery!

John Opoku: With respect, and with permission i differ from the opinion expressed here

1 the Chinese revolution was not staged by the proletariat. It was a peasant revolution

2 every country's revolution is fashioned taken the concrete situation and alignment of forces that exist in each country.

3 independent of the will of individuals, world history has passed through neo-colonial communal, slavery, feudal, capitalist, colonial, imperialism, neo-colonialism

4.marxist intellectuals have debated the current stage in the building of socialism. Some have argued for violent military option, some democratic option as in Nepal etc Others because of analytical difficulties have classified Chinese and Russian efforts as a period of "socialist orientation"

5. dialectically, in analysing china, we cannot overlook America as its opposite in shaping world development (Cuban context of opening a window for small scale private enterprise to ease intra contradictions)

6. role of USSR in providing umbrella support and protection for internal contradictions to sharpen for struggle towards freedom

7 we need thorough analysis using our science instead of condemnation of china otherwise we shall unwittingly be playing into the hands of the west as happened in Maurice Bishops Granada

Lang Nubuor: '... the Chinese revolution ... was a peasant revolution.' Please, Sir, which of the following did such a revolution occasion: 'primitive communal, slavery, feudal, capitalist, colonial, imperialism, neo-colonialism'? If none of these then which? Peasantism, Sir? Asking with due respect, Sir. Greetings.

M Bharat: Yes, Chinese revolution was a sort of peasants revolution, yet a large number of workers did participate, while the Russian Red Army, too, were part of it, under the banner of CPC, not openly.

A Communist party is party of the working class, peasants and all other exploited classes, though under the leadership of the advanced section of the working class, however small that may be.

I am not clear of your question Comrade, but I will only add that post Stalin's death, the CPC failed to expropriate the capitalist class, failed to stop production for profit gradually, failed to maintain dictatorship of the working class and finally failed to resist American imperialism in revolutionary political line but now competing against it for the larger share in the world market!

CPC, under the leadership of Mao, failed to uphold Stalin and denounce Khrushchev, Brezhnev and cliches who were part of restoration of capitalism in USSR!

Lang Nubuor: Comrade M Bharat,

Kindly take note that we **are** talking about the Chinese Revolution and not the Russian Revolution.

You appear to us to be mixing the two and suggesting that the Chinese Revolution **should** have been directed by developments in Russia.

Certainly, such a suggestion does not sound historically dialectical since a revolution in a particular society is essentially determined by the dynamics of **that** society and never those of some other society.

Regarding your difficulty with the question we raised, you and we know that all capitalist societies were evolved and led by the capitalist classes which had emerged in feudal societies. They undertook the Bourgeois Revolutions.

Just in the same way the nobility that emerged in the era of slavery led the evolution and emergence of feudal society; that is, Feudalism.

On the basis of this historical narrative and trajectory it was anticipated that the projected Socialist Revolution would be evolved and undertaken by the Working class that had emerged in capitalist society.

Hence, the nobility class begets Feudalism while the bourgeois (capitalist) class begets Capitalism and the proletariat (working) class begets Socialism, according to the historical narrative.

All three were consequent upon Revolutions respectively led by these classes as Feudal Revolution, Bourgeois Revolution and Socialist Revolution.

In that light, our question sought to know what the asserted Peasant Revolution led to. A Peasantism or what?

In other words, what kind of society did the asserted Peasant Revolution create in China?

Comrade, we observe that when **you** referred to 'a sort of peasants revolution' you were not that confident in your characterisation of what took place in China.

Was it really a 'peasant revolution'?

Our reading of Mao's works in the 1940s does not suggest to us that the Chinese Communists projected a 'peasant revolution' or saw themselves to be engaged in one.

Mao was very clear in a speech where he projected a **capitalist** system that would create the requisite conditions for transiting into a Socialist society.

This appears to be the basis of the difficulties between the then Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The Soviet Union, under Stalin, sought to skip over the capitalist stage of development while the People's Republic of China sought to go through it.

Stalin's difficulties are well observed in his book *Problems Of Socialism In The USSR* or something to that effect.

In that book he explains that there was no sign of the emergence of socialism in Russian society at the moment of the eruption of the Great October Revolution.

That would have set the foundation upon which to **build** Socialism rather than **impose** it as he tried to do.

What rather existed at the time was an emergent infant capitalism within the womb of a collapsing Feudalism.

As it has turned out to be, the Force Of History in its dialectical development cannot be aborted in its essential direction; though, as Stalin points out in the cited piece, can be directed in a desirable manner to achieve projected ends.

Unfortunately, Stalin himself failed to swim on the current of history in his attempt to rather impose things on it.

Comrade, the question still remains: was there really a Peasant Revolution in China and what form of society has it created in that country?

We sincerely seek to learn from John Opoku on this score. Sincerely.

For, we could be mistaken in our understanding and interpretation of the Chinese Revolution.

Thanks for indulging us.

M Bharat: OK, understood what you wish to say.

Too many observations and theories.

To start with, I am giving you the thought related to Chinese Cultural Revolution, which is written as a reply to Socialist Unity Center of India (SUCI & its late leader Com Shivdas Ghosh)!

Bit longish but needed to understand what we think. Then We will come to Chinese Revolution and so called Stalin's mistake!

Lang Nubuor: Thanks, M Bharat. That would be most appreciated.

M Bharat: Lang Nubuor Hello Comrade, to my dismay, my post as quoted could not get uploaded as the volume was big. I will have to make it into pieces of the relevant parts.

In the meantime, copy & paste on Stalin (of another comrade):

Results of the Stalinist leadership policy of the USSR

- The growth of industrial production by 4.5 times only for 1928-1937.

- The output of the USSR on the 2nd place in the world (after the United States) in terms of industrial production.

- The growth rate of industrial production held in the 30-50s. at the level of 15-25% per year.

- Reducing the gap with the developed capitalist countries in the production of industrial products per capita.

- The working class grew from 4.6 million in 1922 to 19.7 million in 1940 and to 25.2 million in 1950, its education and qualifications increased many times over. The agrarian overpopulation was eliminated, giving rise to shortage of land and rural unemployment.

- From the workers 'and peasants' youth, a new scientific, technical and creative intelligentsia grew up. The USSR became the first country to build nuclear power plants and launch man into space.

- The transformation of the USSR into a powerful industrial power, economically independent from other countries.

- Creation of the defense industry, which provided the Red Army with everything necessary for Victory, armed it with jet aircraft, missiles, and nuclear weapons after the war.

- As a result of collectivization, the energy supply of peasant labour increased already by 1940 compared to 1928 by 22 times, the development of agriculture went on an intensive way with little, compared to world practice, government spending. The collective farms were able to consistently provide the country with food, even during the Great Patriotic War, when fertile lands were in the occupation zone. If in tsarist Russia mass famine occurred once every six years, then in the Soviet Union after World War II there was NEVER MORE hunger.

- Saving Europe from German Nazism, and Asia from Japanese militarism. The collapse of the colonial system.

- Expansion of the territory of the USSR, the inclusion in its composition of almost the entire territory of the Russian Empire, as well as East Prussia, the return of Sakhalin and the Kuriles.

- The economy of the USSR after the war was restored during one five-year plan of 1946-1950 - earlier than in Europe.

- The formation of a socialist camp - a whole group of countries building socialism, successfully opposing the aggressive aspirations of the United States and NATO.

Lang Nubuor: M Bharat, Reading. Expecting the rest. Thanks.

Johnson Tunu: Lenin with his New Economic Policy, and Nikolai Bukharin, a great enthusiast of the Leninist NEP, would have both followed a path of economic development significantly differing from that pursued by Stalin. The Chinese may be said to have taken up to some extent the mantel left by the NEPists. The path to real post-capitalist transformations, unlike the populist revolutionary rhetoric, will be really long and winding, with seeming reversals, and new technologies playing a crucial role in bringing freebies and liberating man from drudgery. Neither Marx, Engels nor even the hard-core Ronald Reagan would've been strongly disapproving of today's Chinese practice. Post-capitalist transformations in the future may largely come due to pressure of the increasingly robot-provoked jobless forcing politicians and top capitalists, irrespective of whether in China or America, to accommodate the population for the sake of social peace.

Joel Emerole: A major failing of African comrades is the rapport with the anti - communist aberration implicit in Trotskyite sectarian ideology rampant in the ranks of the left and trade unions. I am dismayed by the recourse to the casting of doubt on the communist party leadership of China and the USSR, Xi and Stalin, by comrades in typical fashion of Trotskyites. African communists have a task (to) build the communist party from the most advanced Marxist Leninists. Work to build up the ranks to attain the critical mass deemed sufficient to act in that country. establish fraternal links with other communist parties so as to strengthen ties and learn from them . A communist party must be a courageous body that does not vacillate once the revolutionary conditions mature in a country.

Lang Nubuor: 'African communists have a task (to) build the communist party from the most advanced Marxist Leninists' - Joel Emerole.

Inasmuch as African communists need to learn from the experiences of Marxist-Leninists and solidarise with them in their struggles it is absolutely required that they focus on 'the concrete analysis of the concrete situation' in **Africa**.

It is that needed analysis that set Dr. Kwame Nkrumah to spend quality time analysing the African condition with the **universal** tools of Marxism.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin set himself the same task of analysing the **Russian** concrete condition with his application of the **universal** tools of Marxism.

These respective applications generated **particular** tools as are composed in Marxism-Nkrumaism and Marxism-Leninism for the respective analysis of African and Russian conditions.

Any Marxist-Nkrumaist respects Marxism-Leninism as a derivative of the Russian condition and raises no swords against it.

Marxist-Nkrumaists do not, however, seek to import wholesale the tenets of Marxism-Leninism without their Marxist validation in the concrete African condition.

That is to say that some tenets of Marxism-Leninism are applicable in Africa not because Lenin stated them but that they are **also** independently derivable from the African condition.

These mutual derivations from the respective conditions of Africa and Russia do not suggest any act of importation.

This is why there are also some tenets of Marxism-Leninism that are simply not applicable in Africa for the significant reason that they cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be derived from the concrete African condition. They might even negate the dynamics of **that** condition.

In asserting all this let us be mindful that in the respective works of Marxist-Nkrumaists and Marxist-Leninists we find newly-derived tenets that add to the arsenal of the **universal** tools of Marxism. They enrich the stock of Marxism for universal employment and application.

It is, therefore, not a rejection of Marxism-Leninism in Africa when African communists, like Marxist-Nkrumaists, insist on the universal principles of Marxism rather than some Marxist-Leninist **particular** principles or tenets that are out of sync with African history and condition.

Insofar as we can see, on the African scene the immediately relevant applicable system of thought developed and being developed this far is Marxism-Nkrumaism.

Any absolutist adoption of Marxism-Leninism in Africa is very much unwarranted and scientifically as well as philosophically inappropriate.

We beg to observe.

Kwasi Adarkwa: My point of departure is the insistence that Stalinism represents a proper interpretation of Marxism.

The foundation laid by Stalin ultimately led to restoration of Capitalism as was predicted by Trotsky.

I tend to view Trotsky permanent revolution and proletarian rule as the proper way to interpret Marxism and to guard against the rise of the bureaucracy as a class within a degenerate workers state.

China has always been state Capitalist and is now on the ascendancy as hegemonic power. And like all Capitalist hegemonic powers , expansion and " conquests" comes naturally. Their thirst for resources and markets is the driving force. I have been to China a couple of times and the level of income

inequality and consumerism is unmatched. I visited the neighborhood where Mao's office was in Shanghai and it is near a place called the Bund ....it was incredible the level of excessive consumerism. It even has a bull statue (signalling stock markets). And it sits side by side with $1m apartments which are empty and workers living in tiny shacks or homeless.

The Chinese stock exchange is every Capitalist investors dream with even derivatives and futures trading platforms.....pure Financialisation.

Anyone who describes China as Socialist is insulting our intelligence.

Johnson Tunu: It seems the Chinese communists, including the Ali Baba boss, hope to build capitalism and use their control of the State machinery to hasten the construction of an advanced technological society of educated citizens, as a prerequisite for transformations towards a gradually fairer, equitable, post-capitalist set-up.

Joel Emerole: Marxism needs no interpretation! Trotskyites constitute counter revolution and abetment of reaction in the ranks of the working class. Contrary to Marx's behest they have not one example of a successful socialist revolution to show but echo imperialists in excoriating communists leaders and. socialist countries. Can't forget they staged a coup on the 10th anniversary of the Great October revolution against the soviet government that failed. That anti party trend endures in their role as sectarian reactionaries in the service of the exploiting class.

Kwasi Adarkwa: Stalin framed up and murdered all the supposed Trotskyites and sent Leon into exile and followed up and murdered him in Mexico. In between time Stalin murdered thousands of people and put people in re-education camps. And please this is not a reactionary position of an anti-communist but a conscientious criticism of Stalinism. And was Khrushchev a Trotskyite when he denounced the murders of Stalin? I would certainly like to live as a Marxists under such a murderous regime. Communism as described by Engels and Marx does not include the Brutal murder and enslavement of fellow comrades and other human beings. And as Trotsky predicted even in 1927 , the bureaucracy of Stalinism (even without brute murders of Stalinism) would return USSR to Capitalism. Of course i view both Stalinism and Trotskyism with the benefits of hindsight and can recognize the merits in some of their actions. For instance based on hindsight Stalin's betrayal of the Social Democrats and in the process making German Communist Party effective in preventing the rise to power of Hitler and his Nazi. But Stalin was masterful in not jumping into rushed war with Hitler and signed a Non-Aggression pact with the Nazis. It bought time and made Hitler expend much energy fighting the Western Europeans who were hoping the Nazis will attack the Soviets and "deal with the red menace of Bolshevisms". This tactic was unjustly criticized by Trotsky.

Joel Emerole: Hardly surprising, a clear echo of the vile and false assertions of the class enemy, external and internal, of the communist party! Hardly worth a. response!

Kwasi Adarkwa: Stalin Butchered his own comrades and That is a historical fact.

Kwasi Adarkwa: I don't want to be butchered by my own comrade on the basis of tactical or even ideological disagreement. And surely you will not want to be butchered for tactical or even ideological disagreement. And let's make it ....The party must be subordinate to society and not the other way round ....that is the proper interpretation of Marxism.

Lang Nubuor: 'The party must be subordinate to society and not the other way round ....that is the proper interpretation of Marxism.' (I love that!)

That reflects the essence of the strategy of Alternative Development - one observes the direction of the working people in their developmental struggles and creatively **assists** that process but not **imposes** a direction fabricated from elsewhere on it.

Stalin was aware of this and correctly stated it in his book *Problems Of Socialism In The USSR*. Unfortunately, his over-enthusiasm impelled him to gloss over it to rather apply **force** to establish socialism from above.

That was at a time when he acknowledged that capitalism was in its infancy while the seed of socialism was absent.

By his analytical construct one has to swim on the current of history to direct it to desirable ends. In contradiction of this solid position, though with the best of intentions, he rather chose to **impose** socialism on Soviet society when its seed among the working people was absent.

His over-enthusiasm for socialism in his lifetime impelled him to brook no opinion, even from well-meaning comrades like Leon Trotsky, which suggested a development other than his choice of imposition by force from above.

The Force Of History in its dialectical development cannot be aborted in its essential direction. One needs to drive on its crest to creatively direct it to desirable ends. The Soviet Union's experiment with force from above failed in this direction.

Comrades, it seems to us that it is not our duty in Africa and the world at large to partake in the false Stalin-Trotsky antagonism but to make 'the concrete analysis of the concrete situation' in **Africa** our focus.

We are in no doubt that the quote from Kwasi Adarkwa above is correct. As said it reflects the organic strategy of Alternative Development which swims

on the initiatives of the working people in development on the basis of the Marxist analytical principle of 'the concrete analysis of the concrete situation'.

It is also a principal tenet of Marxism-Nkrumaism.

Let's grow slowly in silence and allow the silent voice of **PROCESS** to build us in success.

Let there be ceasefire and there it is! Hahahaaa!

Kwasi Adarkwa: Hahaha ...Gbeyecious. I do get it now

Joel Emerole: Marxism itself is a material force that communists vanquish the reactionary force that the bourgeois classes employ to sustain the society in their interest. This is what constitutes dictatorship and its class character. Society is not an entity devoid of dominance by a class ideology imposed by the class in power. It is therefore shear nonsense to deem it inappropriate when communists exercise the proletarian dictatorship but acclaimed as rule of law when the bourgeoisie have been ruling with even worse brutality. BTW the lack of revolutionary practice is our undoing! We are incapacitated by academic debates without practice.

BACK TO CONTENTS

JOURNAL OF MARXISM-NKRUMAISM

Publishers

Centre for Consciencist Studies and Analyses (CENCSA)

Establishment

December 31, 2014

Media Type

Online

E-mail

cencsa2011@gmail.com

Blogs

www.marxistnkrumaistforum.wordpress.com

www.consciencism.wordpress.com

www.lammpcencsa.wordpress.com

BACK TO CONTENTS